

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-28, 31 and 32 are all the claims pending in the application.

**Preliminary Matters**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for entering the Submission of October 5, 2007.

Applicants also wish to thank the Examiner for entering the Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.132.

**Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-28, 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. (US 2002/0026443; henceforth “Chang”) in view of Chou et al. (US 6,370,541; henceforth “Chou”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Chang discloses “..a processor-implemented method of managing a persistent folder within a federated content management system that includes a plurality of local federated data stores...” comprising substantially all the features recited in claim 1. The Examiner acknowledges that Chang does not disclose “wherein the persistant federated folder has the ability to save a federated search result...”, as recited in claim 1. However, the Examiner further asserts that Chou discloses a federated folder as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has misconstrued the Chou reference.

Claim 1 recites in part “a ...method of managing a persistent federated folder... comprising: creating the persistent federated folder on a local federated datastore...” *See* lines 1-

4. Claim 1 also recites “...the persistent federated folder has the ability to save a federated search result...” *See* line 6.

Chang is directed to “...a computer method and system capable of searching multiple heterogenous data stores with heterogeneous data types...” *See* Abstract. Chang discloses a method where a generic query is translated into multiple appropriate queries in order to search multiple datastores. Search results are displayed in “a hierarchy that maintains sub-grouping information from each datastore...as a single collection of results.” Chang does not disclose “creating the persistent folder” which “has the ability to save a federated search result” as claimed.

Chou is directed to “...a design and implementation of a client/server framework for federated multi-seach and update across heterogenous data stores...” *See* Abstract. Chou provides “an object oriented model” for “integrating one or more heterogeneous datastores with a federated datastore.” *See* Col. 4, lines 24-26. The Examiner points to two particular sections of Chou and asserts that these sections disclose “creating a persistent federated folder” which “has the ability to save a federated search result.” However, the Examiner has misconstrued these sections.

The first section, Column 106, lines 15-55, describes the “Federated Collection” datastore base class. As described in this section, the federated collection “...allows an application program to process data objects resulting from a query as a group... and at the same time preserves the sub-grouping relationships...” *See* lines 17-20. This section discloses making the

results of a query available for processing, but does not disclose “creating the persistent federated folder” which “has the ability to save a federated search result.”

The second section referenced by the Examiner, Column 113, line 29 to Column 114, last line, describes the DKFolder object class. The purpose of this object class is to hold a collection of document dynamic data objects (DDO) and folder DDOs. The DKfolder internally keeps track of additions or deletions to be reflected when the DDO is saved to the back-end datastore. When new document and folder DDOs are added to or deleted from the DKfolder, the datastore immediately reflects the change. This section does not disclose any features related to query or search results. This section is only directed to updating the datastore when document and folder DDOs are added or deleted from the datastore. Therefore, this section does not disclose “creating the persistent federated folder” which “has the ability to save a federated search result.”

Neither Chang nor Chou, individually, or in combination, teach or suggest “creating the persistent federated folder” which “has the ability to save a federated search result. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references and respectfully request that that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Further, claims 2-16, 31, and 32 all depend from claim 1, which has been shown above to be patentable over the combination of Chang and Chou. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency and respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

With respect to Claims 17 and 24, the Examiner asserts that Chang in view of Chou discloses the method which has been implemented in claims 17 and 24 as a computer program

product and system, respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has misconstrued Chang and Chou.

Claim 17 recites in part “A computer program product having instruction codes... for managing a persistent federated folder within a federated content management system... comprising: a first set of instruction codes for creating the persistent federated folder... wherein the persistent federated folder has the ability to save a federated search result...” *See* lines 1-7. Similarly, claim 24 recites in part “A processor-implemented system for managing a persistent federated folder within a federated content management system... comprising: means for creating the persistent federated folder... wherein the persistent federated folder has the ability to save a federated search result...” *See* lines 1-6.

As discussed above, neither Chang nor Chou either individually, or in combination, teaches, or suggests “creating the persistent federated folder” which “has the ability to save a federated search result.” Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references also do not teach or suggest a computer program and a processor-implemented system capable of “creating the persistent federated folder” which “has the ability to save a federated search”. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 17 and 24 are patentable over the cited references and respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn as well.

Further, claims 18-23 and 25-28 depend from claims 17 and 24, which have been shown above to be patentable over the combination of Chang and Chou. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18-23 and 25-28 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency, and respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/664,200

Attorney Docket No.: A9661  
IBM Docket No. SVL920030068US1

## Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Ruthleen E. Uy  
Registration No. 51,361

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

**46159**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 27, 2008